



Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor's Name and Address:	MFDR Tracking #:	M4-07-5705-01
PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL OF PLANO		
3255 W PIONEER PKWY		
ARLINGTON TX 76013-4620		
Respondent Name and Box #:		
Hartford Insurance Co. of the Midwest		
Box #: 47		

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION

Requestor's Position Summary: "Understanding that TWCC is wanting to move to a hospital reimbursement of a %-over-Medicare, we have used that methodology in our calculation of fair and reasonable. Medicare would have reimbursed the provider at the base APC rate of \$2254.59 for APC# 0046. Allowing this at 140% would yield a fair and reasonable allowance of \$3156.43."

Principle Documentation:

1. DWC 60 Package
2. Total Amount Sought - \$1,617.32
3. Hospital Bill
4. EOBs
5. Medical Records

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION

Respondent's Position Summary: "It is the Respondents position that the Requestor was paid more than a fair and reasonable amount as determined in accordance with the criteria for payment under the **ACT**. Specifically, the amount paid by the Respondent was more than that which would be allowed under Medicare. Respondent has paid Requestor \$1118.00 which is the same amount that a full service hospital would be paid for its facility charges associated with a spinal surgery and a one-day inpatient hospitalization."... "As the Requestor, the health care provider has the **burden to proof** [sic] that the fees paid were not fair and reasonable"... "In summary the Requestor was paid more than a **fair and reasonable** amount as determined in accordance with the criteria for payment under the **ACT** and is not entitled to additional reimbursement"...

Principle Documentation:

1. Response Package

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
6/28/2006	W10, 89, W1, 193	Outpatient Surgery	\$1,617.32	\$0.00
Total Due:				\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division Rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Medical Reimbursement*, effective May 2, 2006 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason codes:
 - W10 – “No Maximum allowable defined by fee guideline. Reimbursement made based on insurance carrier fair and reasonable. Reduced to fair and reasonable.”
 - 89 – “Professional fees removed from charges. Services billed for radiology, lab, and/or pathology by a hosp, should normally be billed at the TC rate.
 - W1 – “Workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment. When medically necessary, implantables & orthotics and prosthetics are reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10% per the Texas Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline.”
 - 193 – “Original payment decision is being maintained. Final action. In accordance with Rule 133.250 (g): ‘A health care provider shall not resubmit a request for reconsideration after the carrier has taken final action on the request.’”
2. This dispute relates to outpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 2, 2006, 31 TexReg 3561, which requires that, in the absence of an applicable fee guideline, reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers’ compensation health care network shall be made in accordance with subsection §134.1(d) which states that “Fair and reasonable reimbursement: (1) is consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011; (2) ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and (3) is based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available.”
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual’s behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
4. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A), effective December 31, 2006, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, 31 TexReg 10314, requires that the request shall include “a copy of all medical bill(s)”... “as originally submitted to the carrier and a copy of all medical bill(s) submitted to the carrier for reconsideration in accordance with §133.250 of this chapter”... This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on April 30, 2007. Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided a copy of all medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A).
5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C), effective December 31, 2006, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, 31 TexReg 10314, requires that the request shall include “the form DWC-60 table listing the specific disputed health care and charges in the form and manner prescribed by the Division”... Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the documentation does not support that all the services in dispute were rendered on the dates of service listed on the requestor’s *Table*. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C).
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), effective December 31, 2006, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, 31 TexReg 10314, requires that the request shall include “a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include”... “how the Labor Code, Division rules, and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues”... Review of the requestor’s position statement finds that the requestor has not discussed how the Labor Code, Division rules and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii).
7. Division Rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(G) , effective December 31, 2006, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, 31 TexReg 10314, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable”. The requestor’s position statement asserts that “Understanding that TWCC is wanting to move to a hospital reimbursement of a %-over-Medicare, we have used that methodology in our calculation of fair and reasonable. Medicare would have reimbursed the provider at the base APC rate of \$2254.59 for APC# 0046. Allowing this at 140% would yield a fair and reasonable allowance of \$3156.43.” Review of the requestor’s position statement finds that the requestor did not discuss or explain how it determined that 140% of the Medicare rate would yield a fair and reasonable reimbursement. The requestor did not submit evidence, such as redacted EOBs showing typical carrier payments, nationally recognized published studies, Division medical dispute decisions, or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, to support the proposed methodology. Nor has the requestor discussed how the proposed methodology would be consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011, or would ensure similar reimbursement to similar procedures provided in similar circumstances. Additionally, the provider did not submit documentation to support the Medicare payment calculation. Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not discussed, demonstrated or justified that the payment amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with 28 TAC §134.1. The request for additional reimbursement is not supported.

8. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(A), §133.307(c)(2)(C), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii) and §133.307(c)(2)(G). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to meet its burden of proof to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), § 413.031 and § 413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.250, §133.307, §134.1
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION AND/OR ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the Requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

Authorized Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

Date

VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division Rule 148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code Section 413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code Section 413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.